

TRANSACTION NO. I.

The Bengal Theosophical Federation.

PSYCHISM AND THEOSOPHY

*(A paper read before the Serampore Lodge T. S.
April, 1907.)*

BY

THE DREAMER

EDITED BY

Priyanath Mukhopadhyaya, M. A.

Calcutta.

PUBLISHED BY

AGHOR NATH DATTA, M. T. S.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

87 Anherst Street, & 120-2 Musjidbari Street

1907.

[Price 8 Rs only]



PRINTED BY J. N. BOSI,
Wilkins Press, College Square,
CALCUTTA



PSYCHISM AND THEOSOPHY,

There is scarcely a subject which is for us — students of Theosophy — more momentous and more pregnant with eternal issues, than the one we have taken up for consideration. Specially in the present moment, when events are apparently giving the Society a turn which some of us can not but deplore, has the question become directly or indirectly a vital one. On our right understanding, would depend our individual attitude towards the problems which are pressing on us for solution. When we recollect that our attitude means in a very large measure, the attitude of the humanity of the future, when we realise that consciously or otherwise, acknowledged or not, the teachings of the Theosophical Society are leavening the thought of the world,—then the problem becomes one of very great importance to every one of us. We will therefore try to consider the subject in the dispassionate and unbiassed attitude of students of the Science of the Self, of which Theosophy is but a re-affirmation. With us at least in our search after the Truth—greater than which no Religion is—persons and theories should not weigh. We should carefully eliminate all such factors from the equation, and should never allow our personal emotions to sway our minds and warping our judgments. For however largely may the recent events loom in our mind, we must know that the Self, the Truth is

greater than things and events, persons and theories. We must remember that Life, or our realization of it, is of far more importance in moulding the destinies of the Theosophical Society, than individual action. As the heirs of the ages—as the Self for whom the world exists—our thinking should be based on the evolution of humanity which is our truer self, and not on our separated personalities.

Before we define our subject, we will consider the the various aspects from which a particular thing or event may be regarded. These view-points may roughly be classified in a three-fold way. *First*, we may regard a thing as complete by itself and as isolated from everything before and after. This is the point of isolation, of separateness; and as a matter of fact we can not thus dissociate things. The very presentation of a thing through the senses, has in it a large element of relation, of colouring and interpretation, imparted to it by the accumulated experience behind the senses. A child thus when seeing a thing, sees it as modified by the laws of light, the laws of refraction of the medium of light, and the colourings of the physical eye. Then, there are the modifications, though apparently unconscious, effected by the desire and mental natures in us. Thus on and on; and the object gets coloured by the various strata of consciousness, till it reaches the Self. Our knowledge therefore of a concrete physical object, our idea of a physical thing, gets very largely modified by the colourings imparted by the higher principles in man. Each of these principles represents a type of relation—a specific mode of interpretation and synthesis, due to

which the object perceived gets correlated to the universe of Life and Consciousness within on the one hand, and to the universe of objects around. All Knowledge is thus, relative—not in the sense in which the ordinary Western psychologist regards it, as being governed by the laws of relativity,—but in a far more real sense.

An object is thus a whole—an organic unity, which somehow can enter into intimate relation with everything else in the universe. Its isolation is an apparent one. Like the lowest point of a cone, it has in it the potentialities of larger and larger interpretation and synthesis, as man advances in his own knowledge. Its separateness is thus as it were *virtual* and not real. Then we notice that this enlargement in the idea of a thing, is not merely a subjective one. It is real—and it always stands before us, as the symbol of a larger and more transcendent unity which we call differently the Self, the Truth and so forth. Even the apparent “particularity” is really the misinterpreted symbol for the uniqueness of the Self; because the Self is not only the All, but also the One. Hence is it that an object is related to all other things, and is yet at the sametime, the particular object, the “unique.” As each aspect of a thing is the synthetic view of it imparted by the action of the sense concerned, as each sense thus clothes the object or rather the aspect of it, with an universality of being;—so also is this false sense of separateness and particularity, the result of the activity of the separative principle in us. As the eye sees the object thus clothed in the unifying principle we

call light and colour, as the object is thus seen in terms of sound-consciousness with the help of the ear, so does the principle of Ahankara clothe it with the sense of being a separated unique something ;~ thereby not only manifesting the separative reality of the object as *the* object, but also manifesting the same aspect of reality of the Subject on the one hand, and the world around on the other. The concreteness, the particularity, of the object sensed by the physical eye is thus really an illusion due to the projection of the separated I in us. It is because we think ourselves separate, that we clothe our objects with a kind of separative individuality. Truly the Poet speaks of a flower in the crannied wall as the expression of the unity and solidarity of God and man.

The Eastern psychologist goes even a little further. With him all knowledge is but a re-finding--the *re-cognition* of that which is verily within. We can not dissociate things thus artificially.

The second stand-point is of definite relation. It is the stand-point of Science. Every Phenomenon is seen as being correlated with others along certain definite lines. These lines are Cause and Effect, Time, Place, etc. Just as we know the centre of a circle in relation to its radius and the circumference, so also we know things as standing in a fixed relation to certain other things. The more we know of these definite correlations, the more we are said to *know*. Objects thus stand to us somewhat in the same relation as the *locus* of several moving points stands to these points themselves. For the very ideas with the help of which we determine the value and

position of a given event, the very factors which determine and condition our knowledge—are, so far as their definiteness is concerned, themselves variable. Our conception of these factors depends on our experience of the individual facts correlated by abstract principles behind. True it is that these individual factors can be and are regarded, as stages through which the abstract unifying principle behind manifests itself. But this view, though the ultimate reality, is not the one which we generally adopt. It militates against the false view of the self complete object in antithesis to our consciousness. Thus the empiric Science—though it speaks of “quality” “energy” “causation” etc. with reference to concrete things—regards the things as having an independent reality—with these abstract principles of correlation as the attributes. The thing is that, where these attributes inhere. Like all deductive knowledge our conception of a thing thus regarded is really an approximation of an infinite series, the terms of which depend very largely upon our own capacities. Then again we see that the value of an object thus realised is conditioned by the nature of these capacities. With a being having the conception of space in one dimension only, a stick would be merely a point : with a being having two such dimensions, the stick would be seen as a superficial circle ; and so on.

Let us consider the example taken above a little further. Suppose this two-dimensional being we are considering, is on a given plane, and the stick is moved from above down, near him. What would he see ? If he is endowed with the sense of number, he would merely

see a number of such circles in no way connected with each other. The "number idea" itself is a mode of relation by which the separated aspects of a thing, a stick for example, are synthesised into a larger unity. If our being be further endowed with the time-sense, he would see the stick as being a succession of particular circles coming into being from no where, and again vanishing into nothingness. For to add up these aspects, we require the basic conception of Space as the unifying principle governing these apparently discrete appearances. It is only when we have the idea of the three dimensional space that the stick is seen as a definite thing, and the sections as the imaginary and artificial divisions made by us to understand its real unity. We will revert to this later on ; but it will suffice for the present to note that all knowledge due to relation has always an unity behind it ;—an unity which strings up and adds together the various sections or aspects of a thing. For, though apparently relation implies a multiplicity of aspects which are related together, it has an absolute unity for its primary basis,—an idea of a larger life always behind it, to which the separated aspects lead and where they inhere.

Let us take another example to illustrate this position. Suppose a child is asked to add up three and four oranges. Now the words "three" and "four" can in one sense be regarded as implying a multiplicity ;—a complex idea evolving out of simpler units. But behind this, there is a sense of unity, of synthesis. Thus though "three" represents "unity + unity + unity," yet it itself a definite thing, a self-complete thing as against

the other numbers. If these definite aspects of three and four were the only aspects, we could not have added them together. Perhaps another illustration will bring out the matter a little more clearly. Many of us would remember, how in our childhood days we used to get puzzled when working at sums like the following :—“If 2 men, 3 women, and 5 children can reap a field in three days, how many days would it take for 7 men 2 women and 9 children to do the same?” How puzzled and embarrassed were we then ; for the ideas men, women, and children regarded physically are exclusive and self-complete, and would not allow us to add them up. Physically speaking, a man is a complete term and can not therefore be added to any other. As self-complete and isolated, the physical things are incapable of addition, which presupposes something beyond the apparently complete object. We can now understand that in the given sum we are not to add up concrete separated beings. We know now, that for the purposes of the sum, man, woman and child — every one of them, represent work and are the expressions of the higher synthetic something, called energy. Work then, the capacity for producing effect, is the unity of relation by which alone the apparently exclusive and separated things can be synthesised. Viewed from the standpoint of work, not only can we add up apparently different and conflicting things and thereby gain a larger and more synthetic view of the apparently self-complete and isolated things like men women and children ;—but what is more, we gain in a knowledge of a quite different type. We gain an in-

sight into the abstract energy behind things, of which things are but mere expressions.

Ordinarily, our knowledge is seen as the knowledge that arises from the action of definite types of relation known as *quality*, *quantity* and *causality*. Larger the modes of these relations present in our consciousness, the larger our view-point and the approximation. In man of the world, the evolution of things proceeds upon the modes, of objectivity or the quality of being external to consciousness, of 'Kama' or the quality of conducing to the well-being of the personality or other wise, and of mentality or the quality of evoking a particular sensation. To a man of philosophical temperament, the approximation of knowledge includes other terms; and so on. Knowledge thus is a continual approximation of what we call particular things in terms of and as unified by, the Principles of man evolved by us. To a man of the world, the loss of a dear one is an absolute evil unconnected with his actions, feelings and thoughts,—in the sense of being in no way the resultant thereof. It is some thing in which the individual man has no part to play, save that of an irresponsible sufferer, a mere भोक्ता. To an ordinary Christian dimly realising the meaning of the oft-repeated expression "not dead but gone before", the bereavement is valued in a slightly different way. The savage American Indian would add to it the delightful pictures of a happy hunting-ground; while the Calvinist would be quite despondent at the prospects of lurid fires and so forth. The ordinary Theosophist swallowing the realistic, but alas! the materialistic pictures in "Man

Visible and Invisible" would shelter himself under the separative wooden conception of a terrible power called Karmā.

We see, thus that our knowledge and estimate of things vary with the types and modes of relation evolved by us. We see further that though the thing is seen as *the* thing—as something unique and distinct, the sense of unity remains in the back-ground, while adding up in a mysterious way the innumerable equivalents of the thing. These "equivalents" are known as the impressions of the senses concerned. The word 'equivalent' is very significant. It does not mean identity. The object that we see with the eyes is, as we recognise—not identical with the presentment through the eyes. The optic image is but a partial valuation of a thing by the sense of sight. It is of equal value with the object and equivalent to it, only from the stand-point of colour. For just as different countries have different standards of currency which represent the value of things according to arbitrary standards, so also have the senses of ours different standards of evaluation, of receptivity. These are the modes in which the translation, the interpretation, of an object or its aspects, is effected. We see thus, that the knowledge that we derive through the translative power of the senses, of the mind and Ahankara,—the relations brought out by the manifested principles in man—is only a partial presentment of the object, and that the knowledge is a partial expression of the larger life which is behind the object. We need not here enter into metaphysical discussions as to the agencies at work. But

it will suffice for the present to know that the knowledge derivable from a particular sense is really an approximation of an infinite series with a particular coefficient. Thus my knowledge of the table before me, is really a series of visual, tactile and muscular sense-presentations apparently unified by the actions of the mind and Buddhi. The trend of the series is towards a definite somethingness, which we call the table. Now the visual presentation itself is due to, the so-called action of the external table imparting a certain rate of vibration to the medium of sight. What this rate is in its origin is unknown to us. How far this rate remains unmodified, when it sets to vibration the etheric medium, is also unknown. For a translating agency has a life of its own; and no lifeless *upadhi* can serve that purpose. Then there is the specific life and reaction of the physical organism, we call the eye. That the potentiality of the eye is infinite, and that Science knows only a fragment thereof are proved by Science itself now admitting people with Rontgen-rays eyes and by the ever-increasing discoveries of N-rays and other similar rates of vibrations. Can we say then, even so far as the retinal image is concerned, that it is a fair presentation of the object without?

Then come the intervening subtler agencies which translate the retinal image into sensation. Do we know anything of these agencies; and can we safeguard against the co-efficient of refraction in them? Then comes the elaboration of the sensation by the activities of the kamic consciousness. Here again our knowledgs of the agencies is almost nil; and

we know nothing of their infinite potentialities. Then comes the collaboration by the powers of the mind, the infinite potentialities of which are now being discovered in the phenomena of hypnotism. Then there are the actions of Buddhi and Ahamkara, each with their infinite potentialities and activities. That being so, he would be a bold man, who asserts the infallibility of the knowledge we have of the external things even of the physical plane. The metaphysical difficulties as to how and why a thing admittedly physical and gross, can stimulate the powers of consciousness, and why though the subject and object are admittedly mutually excluding, there can be any knowledge at all,—are unanswered. Each of the sense-impressions is thus really the summation of an infinite series of presentments mysteriously converging to a point outside the consciousness. As Theosophy teaches us, every sense is but the relic of the consciousness of a Being larger than ourselves and called a cosmic *Deva*. This complicates the problem even further. As the *Deva* consciousness is the power behind the particular sense impression, there is always the possibility of our objective vision being in reality nothing more than a suggestion of the *Deva* consciousness, in the same way as the mesmeriser's consciousness is very largely the agency behind the visualization of an object by the mesmerised. Then, there are still higher agencies, the actions of which must be understood and eliminated ere we can be sure of our ground. These agencies are the *tattwas*; and they regulate and govern the fundamental modes in which objects are seen by us. Thus the *Prithivi tattwa*, the directrix which measure

the irregular curve of our physical consciousness, clothes the object with the sense of being absolutely detached from the perceiving consciousness, and endows it with an independent reality beyond our consciousness.

A little consideration will bring out this fact. In the first place, we must recognise a certain amount of similarity and commonness which forms the basis of our physical knowledge : the principal feature noticeable in the ordinary waking life is the outwardness and definition of objects. If a phenomenon happens, be it ordinary or extraordinary, we at once look outside for its cause. We believe the cause to be a distinct something—not a general principle—and independent of us. Thus the appearance of an otherwise unknown form, in our visions, is taken as a proof of its genuineness. If objective words are heard, then the proof approaches more towards certainty. If the phenomenon is visible to a number of persons, then it is taken to be absolutely real. We forget this it is dangerous to reason from the effects to the cause, and that the Prajapati created the senses with their mouths outwards. We forget that the sounds may be the result of the workings of our subliminal consciousness, as is often seen in and during abstractions. The outwardness, is often seen as the clinching proof, of its genuineness. But how many of us here, know the why of a physical thing appearing the same to all of us ? Naively, we clothe the object with a reality independent of our consciousness and outside it. We lose sight of the physical *tattwa*, and cannot eliminate its action on our individual consciousness. How this and other *tattwas*

affect us, will be seen, later on. But just as the scientific observer in noting a phenomenon with a lens, eliminates the refractive and isochromatic actions of the lens itself, we also should try to eliminate from our conception of a thing the colourings of these agencies. Not only we do not know what they are in their absoluteness, but we are prone to accept everything that they present to us, without scrutiny and reservation.

Then comes the co-ordinating action of the hierarchies of cosmic Intelligences known under the name of the *Pitris*. Next, we come to that mysterious power known as Ahamkara, which imposes a triplicity of the *knower*, the *knowledge* and the *known* upon everything sent up to it by the lower senses. Like the prism manifesting the one light in terms of the seven colours, the prism of Ahamkara refracts the One Consciousness, and causes it to polarise into a triplicity of aspects. This triplicity is remarkable in its effects. In its essence it is a synthesising principle, which brings together and classifies under a threefold basis, the innumerable infinity of Life and Form. Just as the senses, and the mind eliminate certain aspects of a thing and re-groups the presentment under more general and abstract heads, so also does Ahamkara. But in doing so,—in reducing the world of phenomena to a distinct and central I, certain amount of dramatization takes place. Thus in the well-known case for Mr. Leadbeater's, where an average Englishman not much given to travel, was shown in dream, the luxuriant scenery of a tropic clime, with the result that the dreamer mixed up the remembered pastime of snow-balling (which was a fact of

experience with him), with the projected picture of the tropic clime ; and the Ego or the self-reducing principle had to improvise a drama to account for and synthesise the conflicting mass of facts. So also in the case of the railway traveller ; who aroused by the *bang* with which the porter had closed the door of the compartment, dramatized the sound, so as to cover a number of years of chequered life. In both these cases, the dramatization is the result of the synthetic action of Ahamkara ; and all outer things are utilized to develop the sense of a central I. Yet these graphic scenes are unreal. These are but a few of the agencies that are at work in producing the knowledge of the meiest external things. Yet we think and feel that these presentments are absolute and unalloyed reality. All the causes noted are coloured by the notion of a separated I. What these principles are when looked from an universal stand-point, —what the sense and the mind can and do reveal, to one who looks at them from the standpoint of the Atman—the Self, are never taken into account. On such distorted and fragmentary evaluation of things—many fond souls are content to base their Life and spiritual aspirations. Yet such is not true knowledge,—the Wisdom of the Divine Self.

How then is knowledge possible ? What is the synthesising power which makes the various and often conflicting presentments of the senses and other agencies co-ordinate ; and which unifies them ? For we perceive the object as an unity. What must be the trend of a true synthesis, in order that real Wisdom may be begotten in man ? What should we do to

overcome the element of illusion which underlies all empiric knowledge. The action of this unifying principle is seen even in the separative presentations of the senses. The separateness—the element of centralisation and exclusion or difference—colours the activities of the various organs of knowledge. It is significant here to note that in the Shastras, Ahamkara, the principle of definition of being through separateness and manifestation, gets manifested into a triplicity of lower powers. These are the Svattic, the Rajasic and the Tamasic Ahamkaras producing peculiar effects on the One Consciousness. By the action of the 'Svattic Ahamkara the conception of a definite centre of consciousness is produced. By the Rajasic activity are evolved the principles of *definite* relation known as the senses etc. By the Tamasic activity, the One Consciousness is seen as the object of knowledge outside. The determinative faculty of Ahamkara tends to clothe the One Self with the definiteness of separation. It is as though the Self gets itself thus polarised into the three-fold aspects, in order that manifestation may be possible. These three-fold aspects are governed by this mode of One Life manifesting as definiteness. Just as the hungry man realises himself and his world from the stand-point of hunger, which colours the three-fold projections of Ahamkara in a subtle way ;—so also the great modes of cosmic Ahamkara we know as *Tattwas* govern and control the character of manifestations, and also the resultant knowledge. Hence is it that in our meditations and aspirations after the Divine, the actions of the modes of cosmic Ahamkara colour our individual efforts.

Dominated by the notion of a separative uniqueness of being, we know ourselves as separate from everything else. The separateness in the centre of consciousness produces in the opposite pole, the idea of the object of consciousness as being something independent of it. Thus we are led by the notion of an exclusive I to clothe our world with an equal, though complementary, exclusiveness of being,—and then gradually base our hopes, fears and aspirations on these so-called objects. This notion of a separate I so persists, that when, after death in the case of ordinary individuals, and while living in the case of *Jogis*, the consciousness functions on the astral and mental planes,—we see very little of these universes. We see these as conditioned by the notions of the physical separated self. Nay, we measure them with the separative standard of knowledge of the physical-plane life. The limitation of view therefore is two-fold. It is *qualitative*, in the sense of being coloured by the primary illusion of the separate self which as we have seen goes to clothe the object with external being and reality.

This is due to the primary principle of Ahamkara. We must again recollect that the threefold manifestations of Ahamkara, are more abstract than physical things, concrete desires, concrete mental images and so forth. The threefold divisions of the *subject* or the knower, the *object* or the known, and the *knowledge* are not tangible things like those on the physical plane. They may be likened to tendencies to polarise; rather than to concrete poles. Thus the I—*notion* we have, though separative, is yet capable of transcending

concrete things. The "I" of the physical plane thus, can remain the same in the midst of pleasures and pains, joys and sorrows. In the battlefield, this sense of the I helps even in transcending death. So that, the effect of Ahankara proper is to re-group the phenomena into distinct, though abstract, types of—*knowability* or object, *receptivity* or subject, and *relation* or knowledge. These three types when coloured by the *tattwas* the principles of determining the I outside, or the principles of inhibition—produce an infinite variety of triplicities of varying density and concreteness—till the physical is reached. But the main types remain hidden and become densified. The "abstract susceptibility" of consciousness becomes the rigid separative I, which gains in power by the antithesis of the so-called objects. The type of "knowability" becomes the rigid and well-defined object. In the astral plane, the rigid antithesis of the unknown and unknowable x of objects, gets mellowed into sentiency,—the power of evoking definite sensation. So on and on. These stages of comparative and decreasing antithesis, are thus governed by the cosmic Ahankara known as *tattwas*. For *tattwas* have this tendency of appearing apparently outside the individual consciousness. This is apparently so; for as we transfer our consciousness to the level of Divine Thought whence originate the *tattwas*, we see that they grow less rigid and less independent of our consciousness. Hence we may denominate the modifications effected by the *tattwas* as a quantitative one. This quantitative colouring is twofold. In the first place, the *quantum* of reality in the physical centre of consciousness and the idea of a

separative concreteness and uniqueness of being, which is the characteristic of the physical centre,—so colour our conceptions, that the likes and the dislikes of the physical plane consciousness are taken with us into the astral and the mental plane lives. Thus in the astral plane descriptions which are current in the Theosophical literature, things are measured by the likes and the dislikes of the physical I and its definite desire-capacities. In the mental plane, immersed in our personal thoughts,—thoughts coloured by the physical separative type of consciousness,—we project into the Devachanic life the hopes and loves of the physical personality. The more advanced students may not be under these crude tendencies; but he also tries to measure the higher plane existence by the foot-rule of the physical standards of knowledge and experience. The glamour of the physical thus persists even on the higher planes.

These are but a few of the inherent difficulties which attend the second mode of knowledge that we have been considering. The terms of the series are not individual things but abstract tendencies, coloured by the abstract types of relation,—of which we know nothing. The trend is due to Ahankara,—which we know no details of. The addition of the series is due to the One Life,—which we disregard in our desire for concrete uniqueness. We will now try to see what Psychism is, and how it can be differentiated from Theosophy, the true Divine Wisdom,—which forms the third mode of knowledge we are considering.

What then is Psychism? In defining it, we will try to make its connotations as large as possible. In the first

place, Psychism is a mode of knowledge of which the pivotal point is the conception of a separative central self. In other words, it is the resultant knowledge appertaining to consciousness regarded as a definite centre quite distinct from its environment, a knowledge therefore in which the value of objects lies in their power of opposing the separated consciousness. The conception of a centralized self colours the knowledge thus obtained, both qualitatively and quantitatively. The quantitative expression of the centre of consciousness, means and implies the functions of definite capacities and powers, with the help of which the apparently objective world of presentations gets itself reflected in and reduced into the central I. In the language of the Vedanta, this quantitative expression is technically called the Rupa. The qualitative element clothes it with being ; and the centre of consciousness thus regards itself as wholly separate. Hence it clothes the object with form, which though serving to express the life, is yet rigid enough to keep it separate from everything else. The table before us may be known in different ways. We may try to realise its purpose, usefulness, and constitution ; yet it transcends such knowledge. We cannot disintegrate this table into its constituents, and then re-integrate these so as to reform it. If we knew everything of it,—if the knowledge of its constitution and being was really true, - then we could have reproduced it by adding these so-called elements together. Its knowability is insignificant compared to its unknown being, and is in direct antithesis to it. This is its form or Rupa, the unrealized residue, the insoluble portion of it

which still resists my knowledge. My knowledge is thus the quantitative assimilation of the object, limited by the qualitative expression thereof. The knowledge thus is distorted by the resisting element. It may approach or approximate towards its being ; but it will never do so, so long as the inherent or qualitative limitation of resistance and antithesis remains unassimilated. Let us take an analogy from the physical consciousness to see how the Rupa element acts. To a blind man the world around is a reaction or a representation of the particular sense-activities other than the eyes. Things and events in the outer world are related to the consciousness, with the help of these sense-activities. This is done generally with the sense of hearing. To a deaf man on the other hand, the world is generally a co-ordination through the sense of colour. Each of them sees the world as a series of terms or aspects, which are partial and fragmentary, and which represent but a portion of the true being. Each sense impression therefore is also a qualitative expression of the whole life of the subject and the object, and which colours also the knowledge itself. The mnemonic or memory chains differ according to the particular sense, active. The mind merely collaborates these along the lines of the senses. Thus, though the table before us is the synthesis of the visual, tactile and other sensations associated together by the mind, the mind itself adds nothing to the representation of the object save and except by adding them up. Hence ordinarily we find that the estimate of an object is merely the arbitrary addition of some of its aspects as grasped by the



various senses. The additive power of the mind known as *Samkalpa* and the power of difference or distinguishment of the sensuous aspects called technically *Vikalpa*, are impressed into the service of the senses. We know nothing of the nature of the object as seen by the mind itself un-influenced by the formal sense—activities. The sensuous stamp is over it. Instead of the mind being the *Raja* of the senses—guiding and controlling them, correcting the errors,—it is on the contrary made subservient to the senses. The unrealised residue, spoken of above, is increased by the passivity of the mind, merely content with grouping the sense-impressions. Yet we know that the mind in us typifies the consciousness underlying the *Agni tattwa*. What this consciousness is—and how it acts cannot be known, unless the mind is transcended. For we know things just as our consciousness transcends its objective or apparent aspect. Hence a vision on the astral plane would not bring us nearer to the Reality. Only by transcending the body-idea, we are in a position to know the painful symptoms of a physical ailment. By transcending the desires, we come to know of their nature and potentialities. All knowledge thus is transcendental in its tendency, and always points to a larger unity which embraces the organs of knowledge—their activity and the so-called objective aspects of the thing known. It is the action of the mind getting thus polarized into the nature of the senses, that gives rise on the other pole to the notion of a diffusive and vague kind of mentality surrounding every object of sense ; and we know how a large portion of what is called the subliminal consciousness is due to this polarized action of the mind.

Thus we come to another great principle,—that not only is an object of sense limited and conditioned by the partial and fragmentary power of response belonging to the sense, but we have the unrealised mental residue subtly colouring the impression and thereby giving rise to illusion. Let us take a concrete example to illustrate what we mean. We must remember that the mind and the senses may be regarded as the two poles of consciousness. Just as the unit of attractive force displayed by the north pole of a magnet, evokes into being the unit of the repulsive force of the south pole, so also a particular mode of separative definiteness in the sense awakens the powers of mind in a corresponding way. So that we may apparently inhibit the senses ; yet the activity of the mind is largely coloured by the unrealised residue ; and we know nothing of the mind and its evaluation apart from this.

These powers of the mind correspond thus with the aspects of the senses stimulating the mind, though they are not indentical. Their very correspondence shows forth the larger or the free and non-polarised life beyond. Hence we see, that the apparent objectivity of the senses produces an objective image in the mind corresponding to it. As already noted, the mental image merely corresponds and is equivalent of the sense-stimulation, and that there is no guarantee of truth in this correspondence. The reason of the lower sense stimulation reaching the mind—is not because of any thing in the senses *per se*,—but because the mind in its polarised aspect is the life underlying the

senses. Hence every sense—impression serves to polarise the life of the mind further,—thereby accentuating the normal polarisation. But the mind is, as we know, more powerful and more abstract, than the senses. Hence as soon as a mental image is produced, it serves to polarise the more abstract powers of the mind. The consciousness which manifests through the pure mind—the *agni tanmatra*—is a pure and abstract consciousness of transcendental apperception. This we can not know in its unalloyed form. It is not even the consciousness of the Yogi on the mental plane; for here too, the tinge of the physical uniqueness is on it. When this abstract and as Myers dimly suggests, “this primitive receptivity” is affected by a lower type of consciousness underlying the senses, then there is a polarization of the pure mental consciousness. Just as the abstract motive power in the hand is polarised into a definite manifestation when it comes into contact with a fiery substance, manifesting as action,—so also the mind gets polarised. Just as the motion of the hand thus manifested is equivalent to the sensory impact in power, character, and nature, so also the polarised mind. What we speak of as the *Vritti* or function of the mind, is that equivalent to the sense—impression in character, intensity and nature. We must not forget that this *Vritti* is a fragmentary aspect of the whole mind, and can not be a measure of its true nature. Hence is it that Patanjali advises the control of these *vrittis*, in order that by control we may transcend these formal functions, and thus realise the pure abstract mind beyond. As we transcend the particular aspects of

things, as we eliminate their formal nature, so, also we must transcend the changes in the mind to realize its true consciousness. This is done by attending carefully to the other and non-sensuous pole of the mind, manifested into being by the *incoming of the sensory image*.

Hence we notice that simultaneously with the production of the mental image and the consequent definition in the mind, the abstract powers of the mind begin to play. It is as though the concrete image on the one pole, sets free the abstract powers on the other pole. These abstract powers manifest as the laws of association. We see further that the trend and nature of the abstract power of the mind thus manifested, depends on the nature of the mental image sent in by the senses. The abstract powers tend to supplement the separated image and clothe it with mental being of a similar, though abstracter type. The phenomenon of visualisation is thus due to the unifying and creative powers of the mind polarised into manifestation, with the result that the sensory image is clothed with definite being and appears as objective,—the mind furnishing the elements of formal being. Unless we can by training and dispassion, and by yearning after the Unmanifest Life, direct our attention to the *string* or *sutra*-consciousness manifested on the other pole, our knowledge is apt to be distorted by the limitations of the senses. *Polarisation is the only possible device of manifesting the relatively non-manifest of a plane*. But we can never grasp its true significance, we can never rise beyond empiric knowledge, unless we neglect the sensuous as lower, and turn our attention to the apparently non-manifest Self by holding our

souls in quietness and stillness. Unless we know the exact nature of the mind,—of the Buddhi and the Ahamkara, we are apt to regard the image as independent reality, being unable to eliminate those subtle factors which colour our view.

What is true of the mind, is thus truer still of the higher principles. As a fact the polarisation of the mind principle similarly affects the principle of Buddhi ; and this again in its turn polarises the Ahamkara. Every physical perception therefore is primarily an arbitrary accentuation of the separated aspects of a thing, and is coloured by the tinge of false separateness of the physical *tattwa*. A visual image is the result of the eye inhibiting the infinite potentialities of the object and manifesting only the visual. The sensory image reaching the mind polarises it, inhibiting those powers of the mind which conflict with the image. Not only is the mind inhibited in its larger, subjective, and true aspects,—but what is further, the powers of the pure mind in its own plane go to intensify the partial and fragmentary aspect of the sensuous image by filling in the gaps in its incomplete presentment. The greater the powers of the mind, the greater this intensification. A man who is capable of deep thinking, of constructive thought, is the man in whom a sensuous image would be visualised as an external thing with greater vividness than in the case of an ordinary man. Hence is it that even the ordinary man, when strongly roused by emotion, can feel and sense the forces of the astral plane,—though the resultant knowledge is largely coloured

by emotion. A large part of what we know as psychic phenomena is due to the unassimilated sensuous and mental natures remanifesting into objectivity by the action of the mind and higher powers. The astral trials then, of a man of sensuous temperament, would thus always proceed from the particular type of sensuous phenomena connected with his particular imperfections. *

These leads us to another truth. So long as the senses and the mind and the higher principles with their activities, are not properly assimilated by the one Consciousness, their unassimilated residues would always tend to produce phenomena objective to the consciousness and in antithesis to it. How then is knowledge assimilated or integrated into the Self? To know this we must know how consciousness is disintegrated. Knowing the destructive and disintegrating agencies, we can find out the causes which leads to mal-assimilation, and then find out the nature and capacities of the integrating principles in us. We will try to enunciate the root-principle which prevents this synthesis.

We know that under the influence of the tendency towards definiteness, or Ahamkara as it is called, the absolute uniqueness,—the quality of the Self as to remain ever the Self or the One Consciousness, gets defined. This is technically known as the manifestation of Ahamkara into the triplicity of the centre, the radius and the circumference. Thus the One without a Second,—the One who is Secondless, not because of separative exclusion, but because it is verily the One Existence and Consciousness—becomes circumscribed

into a definite centre of consciousness with infinite though definite powers of relations connecting it with a definite field of manifestation. The *aspect of One Self as the substratum of everything, becomes Matter or the permanent possibility of similar feelings, emotions and thoughts.* Of course Matter now, is but a mere tendency, a directive power or *tattwa*. So far as manifestation goes, these three modes are separate. But since the One Self can never be really polarized, since the One Life can never be really exhausted, there is always a certain amount, if we may use the expression, of free unpolarized Self permeating and sustaining the manifested aspects. Thus the mode of consciousness manifesting as matter is its *tanmatra*; but the tendency to unify similar phenomena in a similar way becomes the controlling principle of the *tattwa*. But if these be regarded as discrete and mutually exclusive things, then the *tattwas* cannot mingle together. If the aspect of definition be the only principle underlying the *tattwas*, then they could not be built up together. Hence we read in the Bhagabat, how the great Lord Vishnu — the all pervading Consciousness unified these *tattwas* by overshadowing them with His larger free life. That shows that there is free consciousness underlying matter, and of which matter is but a partial expression.

We see thus Ahankara, the principle of defining and manifesting the I, has three aspects. The first consists in the power of a centre of consciousness always to know itself as a centre of uniqueness. This is called the I-reference, — referring to and manifesting the self-same I. In Matter, this power becomes the

power of expressing the consciousness,—of, as it were, throwing back all the activities towards the centre. By this mode a connection is established between the central I and the Self of matter. This aspect is the aspect presented by matter, as an inhibiting power limiting and resisting the powers of the central I. But we must always note that unifying the three, — in this same sense as an abstract idea unifies within its larger connotation the concrete things which lead up to it and which may be regarded as the partial expressions of the abstract principle,—the abstract Life is always present as the link which associates and binds together the manifested aspects. But the separated aspects *as such* do not lead to it, unless there is the principle of higher synthesis overshadowing them. Just as no application and plodding industry would develop genius in a dull boy, so also no amount of investigation and scrutiny into the separated aspects would lead one to transcend them and reach the aspect of unity beyond. But the presence of the free consciousness can be intuited even in matter. The mere fact of matter giving rise to sensations and thoughts, goes to prove that even in ordinary knowledge also, the free consciousness is active. But such knowledge is still coloured by the limiting influences. These appear to us as the *forms of consciousness*, the specific shapes which consciousness assumes—the *Vrittis* spoken of above.

Now we will consider the specific modes of relation, which we know as the specific powers of consciousness. We find also a certain amount of free energy underlying these. Because Man is larger than

these modes, we find these specific types can inter-act with each other and can converge towards a higher type of reality. If the time-consciousness had no free and non-polarized element, it cannot enter into our consciousness of form or number. The time-sense would thus be excluded from these ; and these aspects would remain un-co-ordinated. The convertibility and correlation of the psychic and higher powers in man, -the fact that a psychic force can produce lower and higher results, would at once prove, that underlying these there is a higher type or more abstract mode of consciousness, of which these specific modes are but fragmentary aspects. The mere fact that any change in a lower *tattva* produces results in a higher,--that actions which are most intangible and evanescent can lead to the Self, goes to establish a connecting consciousness which, as the changeless *substratum* of things, and of actions, feeling and thoughts, can hold these together. It is of the nature of consciousness ;--for all the phenomenal modes do actually and ultimately resolve into consciousness. Things, actions and thoughts with all their reality and concreteness are transmuted into ideas, and thence into modes of capacity. These in turn are resolved into consciousness and bliss ; and thus reach the Self. Thus the abstract power of Ananda or bliss, the bliss of harmony and non-duality, becomes, when polarised, the individual consciousness ever seeking to merge itself into another mode of the One Life. The individual consciousness on the other hand--can only remain the true individual by the expression of its life as thought, which by trying to neutralise the

apparent antithesis of the I and non-I, establishes the true individual of non-separateness and harmony. In short, the *tattvas* are but the expressions, in terms of outwardness and *maya*, of the Divine consciousness. This common basic consciousness, in which there is no duality nor separation, is the consciousness of Iswara in its non-polarised aspect. Just as in the physical body the organic power called "life" is the one source of energy, whereby the "germ-cell" or germ-plasm differentiates by internal segmentation into the rigid physical body, so also it is the free Divine Life, which is the substratum of every thing. It is this Life which is also the Divine Consciousness and Wisdom, that is the origin of every thing. It is this Divine Wisdom, which is the true,—the *parâ Vidyâ*, the Divine Gnosis,—the aspect of the One which ever proclaims the unity of all manifestation. The Hindu gives it the name of the Devi; others call it Sophia. But under whatever name we call it, it is the *fons-et-origo*—the fountain head of all specific modes of knowledge and power. So also behind the centre of consciousness, there is the ever-free Self. It is because the Self is not conditioned nor exhausted by a personality, an individuality or even a monad—that *moksha* is possible. "Nirvana is," so hath said an illuminated Arhat; for it is the ever free consciousness which underlies and unifies the manifested hordes of monads, hierarchies and powers. Because of this ever non-polarised Self, wisdom is possible. As the Gita says "all actions are reduced to wisdom," so this ever free element underlies every thing; and of it the whole manifestation is, and in it, it

ever rests. When this consciousness reveals itself in man, then alone can he see things in the Divine measure. Then alone can he realise his Divine nature, and be free.

This is the residual consciousness. And if our knowledge does not lead to and rest on this eternal element, if we centre ourselves on the fragmentary and evanescent aspects—the sections in Time and Space of the One Self,—then such knowledge is a real source of illusion. *Illusion is ever due to the artificial attempt to divide a thing which is indivisible,—to define in terms of phenomena—that which is above these.* Let us take a concrete example. Let us take the classical illustration of mistaking in the dark a stump of a tree for a man. If we allow the eyes to report correctly, if we do not allow the natural fear of darkness to colour and refract the presentment of the eyes,—in one word, if we do not limit the free activity of the eyes and the mind by the influence of fear (though it may be latent), and if we do not in any way prevent the proper assimilation of the sense-impression by the One Consciousness, then there can be no such illusion. In the example taken, the eyes if left alone would have correctly shewn the configurations of the tree. They can not, it is true, show us the One Self; for underlying the eyes even there is some limitation. But they would have given us a correct physical interpretation, but for the action of fear. Fear again is due to the separated self in identification with the *upadhi*. It is this which makes us read into the presentment of the eyes something which is not there. This is called

Avidya or false and partial knowledge. Apparently however, there is in fear an absence of the unifying substratum. But even fear is a manifestation of the same unity. It is but a mode of relation, but for which we would have continued indifferent to a large section of the manifested universe which did not directly subserve are personal desires and Kama. But for this fear, we could have been content to lead a life of the lotus-eater, and shut our eyes to the organic and later on the transcendent unity which is the Self. Hence the Bhagabat says, that those who see difference, are lead to see the Self as death,—death which forcibly breaks down the artificial barriers created by the personality and even the individuality in man. We see thus even underlying fear, there is the same Divine Consciousness of unity—the Divine Wisdom ; and that what we call illusion is the direct result of this great unifying power being mistranslated and misinterpreted by us owing to the preponderance of the false sense of the separated self. Even false knowledge is the expression of the Divine Sophia in us, limited by the notion of separateness. *Knowledge becomes illusion if we accentuate the desire for separate existence, which by creating an apparently independent subject prevents the true assimilation of the Oneness of every thing, and which thereby projects the non-assimilated residuc of Reality as an independent object.*

Illusion thus in every plane is, is the result of mal-assimilation, of partial acceptance and of the inhibition of the larger Life beyond the phenomenon. Whether in the case of hypnagogic or other illusions

of the senses, or of the illusions generated by the mind, everywhere the same truth is apparent. Not only is the One Life partially or quantitatively expressed by the senses and the mind in their manifested aspect, but there are some *qualitative* or essential limitations inherent to their action. The power of the eyes to respond to light vibrations is such a qualitative limitation. The accentuation of this aspect would lead, if there be no sense of unity behind, to partial knowledge, and therefore to illusion. Thus, if there is an accession of Life on the inner planes, the senses are not only vitalized into activity; but, what is to be noted, they try each of them to delineate the abstract Life behind in terms of the essential qualities of the senses themselves. We have often wondered as to why departed human entities should go through the farce of eating solid food, knowing as we do that the astral body does not require such sustenance. It is purely an illusion under which the entity labours. Habituated to the physical body-idea, the consciousness gets qualitatively coloured by it; and even when the physical body has dropped, the consciousness persists in its wonted mode. Physical food is thus transubstantiated without at all benefitting the entity. In the case of advanced people also, we find the same kind of illusion. Thus the man who has developed the astral sight, sees the astral plane as coloured by his physical pre-occupations. Not only do we thus lose sight of the true unity of Life in the desire for separative immortality by holding fast to our physical notion, but what is further; we seek to interpret the life of the higher planes:

in terms of the lower capacities and powers of consciousness. This is Psychism.

The mistake lies in our forgetting the important fact, that in the higher the lower remains, not by maintaining its lower uniqueness, but by getting transmuted into the fullness of the higher. We lose sight of the fact *that the higher and the more abstract is itself seen as the lower, and that it is only as we learn to reduce the lower concrete life into higher 'plenum' or fulness (पूरु)* that the lower becomes really immortal. This is what we speak of as the law of Sacrifice, which every religion tries to body forth." It is the surrender of the lower in gladsome harmony. It is this self-same truth which forms the basic principle of all knowledge and wisdom. For, is not knowledge itself a sacrifice of the concrete at the altar of the fuller and more abstract principle? We try however to follow the other course. We seek in the name of religion to enthrone our petty selves, clothing the same in the garb of the absolute Self, which is significantly described as the *fearful मौषणं*, the Greater Death (*अतिक्रमणं*) Due to preponderance of the misinterpreted formal element—which instead of leading us to the Self as the one substratum (*अधिकरणं*), makes us see in Form nothing but the element of resistance,—we seek to reach the Life while yet holding fast to the separated self. This is often mistaken as self-consciousness; and people often pride themselves that they can function on the astral and higher planes with all the limitations and powers of the physical separated I. The immortality, in which the whole of the manifested and the unmanifest elements in us, as well as

in our worlds participate, becomes the immortality of the Sankhya with an eternal back-ground of Prakritic panorama to soothe our exalted self-love and *amor propre*.

Psychism this is a mode of knowledge in which not only does the conception of a central existence persist, but what is further, it is very largely coloured by the mode, the nature of exercise, and the quality of the physical senses, and also of the lower I-notion.

We will now consider the subject from another standpoint. *Psychism is essentially the result of the prolongation of a lower plane consciousness into a higher.* It is an attempt to understand the higher in terms of the lower. Thus in the descriptions of the Astral and Devachanic planes by Mr. Leadbeater, we see a very large admixture of the concrete, separative conceptions of the physical plane. Things are measured as if the Ego there, is but the continuation of the physical personality,—separative in its workings and thereby projecting a separate non-I outside it. It is the immortalisation and exaltation of the separated self in astral and mental backgrounds. The force of this remark will be apparent, when we consider for example the value of an astral object. Now the value of a thing is adjudged with reference to certain standards. The proper value of an astral thing would lie in its place and position in the astral world alone and with reference to the pure astral consciousness, and not with reference to the pleasures or pains, hopes or aspirations of the physical. Because a thing is hostile to the conceptions of the physical personality, it is called an astral evil; because a force is apparently helpful to the

separated physical man, it is at once characterized as a good thing.

Now, there is another way of knowing the astral plane. It lies, as we will see more fully later on, in first of all, eliminating the aspect of outwardness which is the hall-mark of physical consciousness. Seen thus, an astral object would be measured not by the physical conceptions of external form, but by the abstract power of *Rasa* (रस) or sentiency. But even that is not enough ; for as stated above, the knowledge of a plane or a thing is possible only as we transcend it. Just as the physical man writhing with physical pain cannot properly estimate the nature and potentialities of the pain unless he is able to withstand its immediate effect, so also *knowledge of a plane is only possible when the consciousness is able to transcend it qualitatively and quantitatively*. So, the Gita lays down that we have at least to forbear, ere we can hope to know the meaning of a thing :--

सांख्यिकस्य भारत

Therefore, oh Bharata ! forbear.

; This forbearance itself may be the artificial forbearance due to the *upadhi* or vehicle of consciousness being made temporarily so rigid and impervious that nothing can affect it. It has been said that the *Sutra* of Patanjali योगश्चित्तवृत्ति निरोधः—“Yoga is the control of the functions of consciousness” means, the hardening of consciousness by separating it continually from the outer. But this is a doubtful advantage, as we will see a little further. Another point in Psychism therefore, is that it is a mode of knowledge through the intervention of a separative vehicle so built

up, that it remains unchanged at the play of forces of a particular kind.

We are now in a position to sum up what is meant by Psychism. *It is a mode of knowledge in which there is the persistence of the central separative conceptions of the lower planes in their separated aspect.* It is a *formal* mode of knowledge, — knowledge in terms of *form* instead of *life*; and the measure of such knowledge is also separative. As a mode of knowledge, Psychism is also a mode of manifestation consequent on this mode of knowledge. All powers are but the concrete manifestations of types of knowledge behind. So that by Psychism is also connoted the exercise or outputtings of powers of a particular kind. It is of this kind of psychic knowledge and power, that the Gita says “the Siddhis of action are soon achieved” क्षिप्रं हि मानुषे लोके सिद्धिर्भवति कर्मजाः । It has been suggested that the word कर्मजाः *born of action* means only “siddhis” attainable through actions. But that meaning is scarcely a sound one. The word “karma” has, throughout the Gita, a special connection with the *gunas* of Prakriti. Therefore the term ought to imply the “*guna siddhis*” Now, in the Bhagabat, we find a significant distinction drawn between the natural powers of the Self,—the powers which ever seek to express the Unity of Life in and through phenomenal things and modes—which are known as the principal eight-fold *siddhis*, and the *siddhis* or powers which spring from the knowledge, separative knowledge as it is, of the Prakritic energies. These latter are clairvoyance, entering into another's

body &c. A consideration of the *siddhi* aspect of Psychism is therefore necessary.

There are two ways of acquiring and wielding powers. In the one, which is most natural to us, we regard the powers as the special property of our separated self. Not only is that so, but what is significant is, that these powers are evoked only when the separated self or Ahamkara is accentuated either by the sense of duty or a still lower stimulus. This kind of exercise requires for its *sine qua non*, the arousing of the self-assertive aspect. This is not even a special quality of the human race. Like desperate men, the cat when cornered will show fight. In this kind of *siddhis*, the separated I strongly wills a thing, and sometimes the necessary results follow. In our egotism we believe it to be due to ourselves. A little consideration will bring the truth out. The Self is really one, though through Ahamkara we polarise it into a separate Ego and a world in antithesis. Just as when a force of,—say, some distinct units, is induced in the one pole of a magnet, there is a corresponding manifestation of force on the other pole,—so also a strong desire in man is sure to produce a corresponding result on the other pole of objects. Just as in the case of the magnet this induction of force is not due to anything belonging to any particular pole but to the unmanifest free energy in the magnet getting thus polarized, so also the phenomenal effect produced along Parakritic lines is not due to the separated Ahamkara, but rather to the One Life behind which sustains both these poles. The strength and intensity of desire must therefore be such, as would make us, for the time

being, lose sight of the body-idea. It must be so powerful as to induce in us an influx of the subliminal life ; or else it would produce no result. This intense desire is thus necessary, not because it is the sufficient cause, but because otherwise the lower I-notion can not drop. This brings out the principle underlying these lower powers. Though these powers may be stimulated into manifestation by the lower desires, *yet they are essentially, as proved by Myers, of the nature of the relatively subliminal self of a given plane.*

The phenomenon produced is *thus the result of the reaction of One Life, and not the action of the separated self.* As the One Life appears to the separated consciousness as the Prakriti, — as the *gunas* are nothing more than the reaction of the One Existence, polarized by our Ahamkara into Prakriti, so very aptly these have very *siddhis* been called *gunaja* or *karmaja*. Here we get at another truth underlying Psychism, be it the psychism of knowledge or of power. An analogy will explain this better. We try to grasp the physically invisible and distant by artificially projecting the powers of sight by calling into our help and impressing into our service the powers of the lens—as when we know, things with the help of the telescope or the microscope. Or we may do it by projecting the physical personality itself, and clothing it with a *mayavi rupa* formed of matter similar in its constituent to that of the object. But as in the case of the eye, its qualitative limitations remain while there is a mere prolongation of its physical power, — so also, in the second way we are considering, the inherent nature of

the personality or the individuality remains the same, even though clothed with a different and a finer body. The old time-worn adage of the rice-husking machine going to heaven and remaining the same, is apposite to these artificial ways ; and the same susceptibility to illusion and mal-assimilation persists.

Now to revert to these powers. The other kind of *siddhis* mentioned in the Bhagabat is significant. The *modus operandi* is peculiar, and if rightly understood would at once make the difference between Psychism and Theosophy clear to all. All these powers are the natural expressions of the unity of Consciousness. Hence the word "स्वभाविक" "swabhabika" or natural, is used in this connection. Because the Self is the one Existence and Consciousness underlying everything, therefore is it present in every thing in the self-same way in its essential nature, as well as in its manifested unity of the organic life. So far as the Self is concerned, an atom as well as a Deva are the same. There is no change in it in quality or quantity ; for is not the Self changeless ? That being so, the atomicity or the power of the Self known as "*Anima*" अणिमा—the power of realising the central aspect of a thing,—is not an accidental power acquired by man owing to a particular modification of his consciousness. It is an expression, a manifestation in the Yogi of the power of that Subliminal Cosmic Self which is at the root of Matter. It proves not that these powers are the property of the Ahankara in us, but there is a Larger Life which can synthesise the apparently separated I-consciousness in man with the antithesis or limit known as Matter. It

is not due to the inhibition of the powers of the separated I,—so that thus denuded of all expressions it may know itself as the *laya* centre of rigidity, which we call an atom. It is rather the result of that synthetic knowledge which can see and realise the unity of the Self pervading Matter on the one hand, and Man on the other. It is due not to the accentuation of the special separative quality of anything, but is rather the immediate result of the Self manifesting in man as a transcendent unity. It represents thus the true Oneness and homogeneity of the Self as the pure Unique, the true secondless Existence, Consciousness and Bliss. It manifests as the Wisdom of the Self, an ever-present Divine power,—only when Man can merge the separative “I”-notion, however high, into the One Self. The powers are not his; for before he gets them in the real sense, he has been transfigured. There is no longer any reference to a separative “I” in him. He has become verily the Self; and these powers are the expressions of the eternal Unity of the Self in terms of the lower planes,—and *not*, as in the case of lower Siddhis, the projections of the separated self. The power of the hand to move, to reach out and grasp an outer object, can be looked at from two different standpoints. It may be regarded as a personal possession acquired by the personality. Such a view, is as we have seen, a partial one,—in which the real Life is overlooked; and hence it is always subject to illusion. For, it does not solve the mystery as to how Matter can be moved by the Mind. It does not explain the nature of the Deva-consciousness which underlies the

activity, nor how the human consciousness comes to wield this Deva power. The same power may be regarded from the standpoint of the One Self. Because the Self is one, we cannot artificially divide it by calling one portion the I, and the other the object. Because the Self is one, therefore the Secondless Unity wells up as a concrete power harmonising the two artificial poles, in order that from the very motion of the hand the wise man may have an idea of the unity of Life and Consciousness-behind. *That* is a lower Siddhi, a psychic phenomenon, *which* is seen and realized *as something beyond*, as something other than the Self. *That* is a lower and a dangerous power, which instead of developing in the "I," a sense of an All-pervading Existence, Consciousness and Bliss, develops on the contrary the sense of a separate I having larger powers and therefore more powerful than the rest of humanity. *That* is Psychism which confines the One Life to the terms of a specific mode of sight, hearing &c., and sees not the absolute homogeneity of Life behind.

Psychism thus as a mode of knowledge is a dubious light at best—containing as it does a large admixture of the separated body-conception and the partial fragmentary presentation of the relies of sense-activities. Hence the Gita says —

यदा ते मोहकलिलं बुद्धिर्व्यतिरिच्यते ।
तदा गन्तानि निर्बीदं शीतव्यस्य शतस्य च ॥

“When thy consciousness transcends the मोह or false knowledge, then do you attain to dispassion as regards things *heard* and *seen*.” The great Sankaracharya takes

the meaning of मोहफलित "turbid waters of illusion" to be देहात्मज्ञानरूपं—"the false knowledge of the Self as separated something, as the self of the body." So long as this false knowledge persists, there will be sounds and sights in every plane to distract the consciousness and take it out. This shows us the real value of the objective sights and sounds of the astral and other planes. This proves that these phenomena are really the result, of the projection of the body-idea. *And as the body-idea is itself the result of retarded assimilation, as the body is the tentative compromise between the I and the non I of a plane in which there is no unity of Life—so all psychic phenomena, however high, are the outcome of false or partial knowledge.* Every such phenomenon thus contains within itself its own refutation in its own tendency towards illusion. This element is further intensified, if we seek therein the guarantee of our separated self.

It may be said, that this definition of Psychism, this analysis of its inherent defects—would lead us to condemn the methods of modern Science. Hence a consideration of the scientific method may not be out of place here. The trend of Science as exemplified in its best exponents, is not towards the accentuation of a separated self. Herein lies the essential point of difference between modern Science and modern Religion. In Religion as practised now-a-days, the centre is the physical personality—which seeks to immortalise itself not by expanding itself, but by so hardening the false separated I that the dissolution of its objective world does not affect its false uniqueness. Science on the

contrary, seeks ever for the universal element. It tries to reduce every thing to be universal elements of matter and energy. It seeks to transcend the phenomenal and the particular, and reach the one element of which everything is but an expression. It seeks thus the same Atman, though clothing it still with an element of outwardness. Hence though liable to error for the preponderance of this spirit of outwardness, its truths are real attempts to reduce the apparent many into the real one. In its eyes, a man is but the result of the environment, and as such is not dissociated from the other pole of life and being. An atom or an earthworm is of the same value to Science as a giant genius among men. It seeks ever to dethrone the false particular and establish the reign of abstract laws and principles which govern man and his world alike. Though its transcendence is still that of difference,—though in its search after the universal, the real uniqueness of the Self—whereby it remains ever the same Self in the midst of change,—is often lost sight of, yet underlying its conceptions of Matter and Energy we find the same uniqueness of the Self manifesting as the *one* substratum of *all* things. Psychism on the other hand, puts a false and separative value on things. It seeks to reduce the outer—not to the transcendent Self, but to the separated I in us, neglecting thereby the aspect of the immanence of the Self. The limitations of Science are thus the limitations of qualitative or *tattvic* bias ; whereas Psychism accentuates, as we have seen, both the qualitative and the quantitative aspects. A thorough understanding of the Scientific trend, is thus

very often a very good corrective to our religious and psychic pre-conceptions, leading us to a fair estimate of that aspect of the Self in which it is the universal substratum of every concrete thing and energy.

We will now try to consider some of the arguments usually advanced to support and vindicate Psychism in relation to the Theosophical Society. It is clear from the analysis of Psychism, that *it is a knowledge of relations rather than of essence*, and that the element of the separated I in it, is what differentiates it from the true Wisdom of Life, which under the garb of Theosophy is being promulgated anew among men by the Society. *It is the trend of the knowledge which we derive in connection with our environments that makes it Psychism or otherwise.* It must be borne in mind, that, though real knowledge is ever transcendental in its direction, and that the Self is ever the goal of all strivings towards knowledge—yet for the sake of convenience the *gnosis* is regarded in a twofold way. These are clearly indicated by the great sayings महावाक्य of the Vedanta. We are to know the Self as the I in us, सोह I am That, as well as, as the one substance in and of which all things are, सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म *verily every thing of definition is Brahman.* Then comes the transcendent unity and synthesis expressed in अहं ब्रह्मास्मि I am Brahman,—not only in so far as the pure spotless, partless Brahman is the only I in us, but also in that It is the one Essence, the one Reality underlying everything of Name and Form. *The Light on the Path* in advising us to seek the Self, first as *within* us—as the Light of the World, the only Light that can

be shed on the Path, then as the Life *without*, and then as the Transcendent Reality *beyond* promulgates the same truth.

People have often wondered at the apparent contradiction involved in the method which runs through the Hindu Scriptures in furnishing us with a mass of phenomenal details and concrete stages through which the one Self manifests as the universe of *name* and *form*. Thus, it has been suggested by that great scholar Paul Duessen in his Philosophy of the Upanishads, that, these details form a halting compromise, a sacrifice of the Reality in favour of Empiricism, in which the rigorous unity of Self is toned down as to embrace the world of manifestation,—and that it shows the weakness apparent in man in seeking to clothe the one Reality in terms of the phenomenal many, which are admittedly empirical. But there is another way of viewing the thing. Not only do we require these empiric forms, in order that by addition and generalisation, the abstract and transcendent Existence may manifest in our mind and consciousness,—but what is oft overlooked, *these concrete things transmuted by the fire of Wisdom shows us the Self as the one Concrete*. The Self is not only the abstract, but it is also the One and the Unique. It is not only the One, but also the Secondless and Unique Self. The element of *oneness* is that of the transcendent unity, which can only manifest through the transcendent element is us—the I, which expresses in terms of limit and manifestation the One, the Eternal and the Beyond, to which all things lead and yet in entering which, things lose their formal nature and manifest only as the I. But this transcendence

is apt to be regarded as separate and therefore of the nature of Ahamkara, unless it embraces also the world of phenomena. Hence we have to realise the element of *secondlessness*—the element which as the one substance underlying everything of Name and Form, reduces the apparent many into the same Self—*imparting thus to the I or the unity element, the element of richness, of potentiality, of expansion and all pervasiveness*. Leave out the I-element, and knowledge becomes the vague and misty abstract unrelated to the I in us. It is then something, which though abstract is yet outside the I as a vague penumbra of misty radiance. Thus the Divine wisdom विद्या which manifests everything becomes the Avidya अविद्या, which limits the I as an external agent working for our undoing. Leave out the element of *secondlessness*,—the element in which the I in us is seen in a mysterious way to be the power which outside the self seems to determine the consciousness as the object,—and the resultant knowledge is of the separative centre as the *Purusha* of the Sankhya Philosophy whose very existence depends upon the background of *prakritic* activity. Hence is it that we find in the Upanishads and the Puranas, descriptions of the successive determinations of the One Consciousness outside the I,—manifesting as *Bhutas* or elements, *Devas* or modes of specific relation, and as *things*. But it is because the Self is the One and the truly transcendent, that the I in us can mix with things ; and *the result is the knowledge of the Self in which Unity and Secondlessness,—non-duality and non-separation both enter*. The 'unity' aspect thus gains in richness and concreteness, and is no longer the vague

feeling of a central I in a background of emptiness and void on the one hand, and in a background of concrete and antagonistic objects on the other. Without this Secondlessness, there can be no motive power in knowledge, so far as manifestation is concerned. Nor can there be that true assimilation, in which the numerical infinity of concrete things is transmuted into the unique transcendence of the Self where universes are indrawn without leaving a residue.

Phenomena thus when rightly viewed, when transmuted into the Life are *essential factors indicating the Transcendent Unity by unifying the apparently rigid antithesis of the I and the non I.* But this is only so, when on the one hand the I in us has so evolved by a rich past of virtues, noble actions and nobler thoughts and aspirations, so that it can embrace the world and know itself even dimly as the truly Transcendent. This is the element which we see underlies मुमुक्षुत्वं or the desire for transcendence,—not the separative desire of escaping from a particular field of manifestation, but rather as the strong desire to merge the lower I of manifestation into the higher Unmanifest as yet but dimly realised. The value of the self-consciousness of limit, therefore must change ; and it must not be dominated by the tendency to refer every thing to a central separated self. Here lies the great efficacy of true Devotion. Then again, we require as the second condition,—the recognition that *the formal separative concreteness of things is not the Reality, but that it is the symbol of a larger transcendent Reality and Concreteness,* into which

everything merges without even leaving a trace. 'It is only when we look through phenomena and dimly see the Secondlessness or Transcendence of the Self running through them,—a transcendence, which is unaffected by the qualities, properties and values of things *as separated things*, --in short when we can see the Nounenon within the phenomena and the phenomena as being of it, then only can phenomena lead to wisdom. In Psychism however, there is a tendency to regard things in their false separative uniqueness, and as 'such it is a mode of *avidya or illusion*.

The miracles enacted, the higher Divine powers manifested by the great Teachers of men, have ever this unifying tendency. They always seek to help us on, *and not to cower us down* by the grandeur of Their powers. The exercise of these powers have always the object that they may help us to understand even dimly the glory of the Self, —furnishing us with data on which we can base the unfolding abstract Divinity in us. The powers are always manifested not to mystify and breed superstition, but to stimulate the developed soul to transcend its false I-notion and thus realise the essential unity. These powers are further exercised *not as mediums, in whom the consciousness of the I is temporarily lost* in the glare of the Higher life manifesting, but in a quite different way. The difference between mediumship which H. P. B. so strongly condemns in her *Key to Theosophy* and elsewhere, and the true Divine afflatus lies in this, that in the former the individual consciousness does not participate and therefore is not conscious of the higher expression,—whereas in

the other *the individual though still preserving its own lines of memory and other powers sees the Higher life as being itself* and not the *other*. So we find great Prophets speaking of themselves not as limited individuals but as the one Self. The medium is very often unconscious ; and even when conscious, sees the Life pouring into him as the Other, as the non-I. The difference between the Vestal virgins and other mediums, and the truly evolved lies here. The former are at best but unconscious instruments utilised perhaps by the higher powers because of the dearth of proper materials : and there is always the danger of the Light shining through, getting refracted by the unassimilated residues of separative life. Hence is it we find in ancient times these virgins always kept pure beyond even the possibility of contamination. But even then, the inherent colouring of the separated I would always remain : and it would be foolish to seek to revive a clumsy method which implies selfishness of a kind. Because we find it difficult to harmonise ourselves to the real Life, therefore in our greed after the supersensuous we must perforce sacrifice another human being to a state of colourless passivity and questionable purity in order that the Higher life may manifest through him. H. P. B's diatribes against mediumship were directed towards exposing this selfish method unworthy of man. The physical and mental purity of passivity is not enough to make the messages thus conveyed, pure and reliable.

It may be said that the third object of the Theosophical Society justifies psychic phenomena. But this view is scarcely a right one. Unless we have in us the

sense of the unity of the Self, no number of phenomena, however varied, can, as we will see, ever lead us to any principle, much less to the Truth which forms the basis of the Society. The investigation into the psychic powers latent in man does not mean simply a search after the uncanny and the mysterious, and the building thereon of an ill-digested theory. It does not imply that we should indulge in hunting after phenomena, such as table-rapping and such cognate things. It does not mean that we are to go gadding about for the out-of-the-way events, to collect and glibly talk on them. But on the other hand, this object means and implies, what the *Light on the Path* admirably expresses—a turn of mind to observe the play of the Life within and without us, *so that by observing its action in and through the concrete infinity of terms, one may realise its depth and unity, profundity and transcendence.* Such observations moreover can never be fruitful of good results, unless we recognise that within us is the Light of the World,—the only light that can be shed on the Path, and that if we can not recognise it within, it will be useless to seek for it elsewhere. For then we will merely see in the outer, an expression of the separated self in us—thereby intensifying the rigidity of the false separated self. Hence is it, that we find the great Teachers of men manifesting these powers of the Self,—which as we have noted go to establish its unity grandeur and transcendence—only before those who are pure in mind, keen in intellect, strong in devotion, and burning with the longing to merge their fragmentary I into the Larger

Life which they but dimly feel. The whole of the *Adhikari latwas* or principles of fitness of disciples recognise this truth and are based on it.

It may be urged that the method of outer investigation is safer than relying too much on the inner, and that people are apt to be deluded more by an unthinking reliance on the inner promptings without the useful and important check of the outer things. The fact is however otherwise. *The danger lies not in the inner, but in the tendency to impart the separative colourings on the inner prompting.* Men have become fanatics not because they relied on the inner,—for the inner I is ever the final tribunal of decision,—but because, they have read into the inner illumination the colourings of the separate I. Thus a message from the Master is seen as if it were a justification for the accentuation of Ahankāra. How often do we see the pitiable sight of an advanced man using the message of peace and harmony from the Holy Ones or the Higher Self, as a means towards false separateness, as a handle by which the inherent unity and solidarity of humanity is disturbed. If any one can not follow the message and apparently goes against it, he draws down on himself the wrath and indignation of the self-righteous: and the one force for union is made a veritable power of destruction.

This shows how the realization of a truth depends upon the inner attitude—and on also the extent of appreciation of its real import and significance. The import and significance of a thing is that aspect of it which presupposes its unity, and not antithesis with other

things. The danger therefore is not one due to the *inner small voice* in us, but rather to the distortion effected by *Ahamkara* within, regarded as a separative energy. *The danger is therefore the same, whether we look for phenomena outside ourselves, or whether we look to the Inner for illumination and guidance.* The outer is only of use to us to the extent that we can assimilate and transmute it with the life of the inner:— and everywhere the truth of a thing lies in the secret cave within us of true *Buddhi*, which as the *Gita* says, has unity for its trend.

Nor is it true that without phenomena, life in the T.S. would tend to gravitate towards inanity, and the T.S. would turn into an intellectual sect. For the principle which makes for limitation and thus for sectarianism lies not in phenomena or otherwise,—but in our attitude,—in our conception of the Self. If our conception is broad enough to embrace everything, if we believe in the unity of the Self which underlies Brotherhood, then a death of phenomena may do us no appreciable evil. When it is necessary for us to know further, we may be sure that Those Who have the guidance of humanity in Their keeping will so order events that we may grow. We do not produce these phenomena ; and the growth lies not in phenomena,—but in reading into them the *message of Unity, Peace and Harmony*, which thinking alone can evolve in us. Phenomena may be necessary to draw our attention ; but it is the inner outputting of the life of Unity which makes for true Wisdom, and therefore for Peace and harmony. We need not fear that the Society will fall behind other societies, if we have

only the Self in view. No individual object can lead us to the Self, if we are immersed in the formal and separative conception. What harm then is there, if the Society which is meant as a school for training men in the unity of the Self— is behind others in the quest after phenomena. Our mission is not to accentuate the separative quest,—but rather to formulate and proclaim a view of Life, which will synthesise the results of human activity in the fields of Science, Philosophy and Religion. We are here not to encroach on the other fields of human knowledge,—but rather to unify and harmonise them so, that by the action of the synthesising principle, every other science may get the true Life, which shows the universe to be really one and an organic whole. The function of the poet or the philosopher does ill harmonise with the outward sensational life of phenomena. The poet or the philosopher must not be of, as Holmes puts it,—the arithmetical type of intellect. The genius is one who can grasp the abstract and transcendent reality behind phenomena which but lead us outside the Self.

When by devotion, by a life of sacrifice and harmony, however humble it may be, in which the phenomena of the astral and other planes have no limiting effect,—when thus we develop that clearness of insight which can see through the formal and separative elements,—then the lowest physical thing shall have a message for us far higher and deeper than years of astral and mental plane phenomena can teach. For is not the Self in the atom as well as in the mightiest Deva? For is not the Self equally present in the meanest flower that

blows, which has such an harmonising effect on the mind of the poet—as in the most mysterious and weird phenomenon of the Yogi. Our aim should be the Self and not the weird and the so-called occult; our goal should be unity, and not separative transcendence however glorious. We must know that the Light of the true Yogi—which is the consecration and the mystic's dream, is the light which not in sea or land, but in the One Self.

Next if we consider *the conditions of knowledge per se*, we will see at once that, it is not the result of the individual phenomenal elements. On the contrary, it is due to the unifying and synthesising principle of true Buddhi or Wisdom. No amount of experience in any phenomena can produce the understanding of the principle underlying these. Just as a number of concrete sums in arithmetic does not necessarily imply the realization of the fundamental principle, so also in the case of phenomena. The abstract principle—the synthesising Life, is what is partially expressed by these individual terms. *The terms have thus two values ;—the apparently concrete value, and the value of filling in a particular place in the series as a whole and expressing in terms of concreteness a portion of this synthesising Larger Life.* We are empirics, if we deal with isolated phenomena only. The arithmetical mind sees only the separative concreteness. The algebraical mind is cognisant of the abstract life beyond. Wisdom or even knowledge is always the expression of the Larger—the Beyond. It is the contribution—the out-putting—the expression of the Life beyond, that gives us the power of adding up these concrete terms. All knowledge is thus the result

of the realization of the relatively abstract Life beyond, as expressing through and controlling a given series of isolated phenomenon. An example may clear the ground. We see every day the phenomena of men and things perishing,—vanishing from their व्यक्त or objective aspect into the unknown Reality, which is their truest being. Does that express any higher type of being and consciousness to man? The only knowledge that it produces,—is the desire for accentuating the physical separated self. Thus the trend of the Science of today, is to devise ways and means, whereby the inevitable dissolution of the body may be prevented or even postponed. The true Alchemy of Divine Wisdom becomes thus the alchemy which seeks to discover the so-called elixir of life. The knowledge of the Astral and Devachanic planes, and the so-called “continuity consciousness” are similarly used in trying to extend the physical I-notion and project its being into the higher planes. Everywhere we find this tendency of reducing higher things to the needs, and for the guarantee of existence, of the physical self. But see what the sight of death produced in the consciousness of the greatest Teacher of man,—the Lord Buddha. The sight of death did not produce in Him the thirst of immortalising the personal self. It evoked in Him the Wisdom of the unmanifest Self,—the Nirvana—in which everything of Name and Form is ever reduced. This is due to the synthesising action of the Divine Wisdom: and where the Sophia manifests,—there we find a similar accentuation of the unity of Self as against the phenomenal reality of persons and things, grosser or finer.

We see thus that knowledge and wisdom do not lie in concrete phenomena,—but in the synthesising principle of Theosophy—the Divine Wisdom. This true knowledge lies not in accentuating the phenomenal aspects of things, but rather in seeing the phenomenal thing in the one Self. The true value of a phenomenon lies not in its separative knowledge—for that is Psychism,—but *rather in the recognition that it is a discrete and apparently separated aspect of the One Life, and that as a fact it is integrated with the whole universe of manifested Life on the one hand, and the absolute homogeneity of the Self on the other.* Life in every plane is the abstract power of unity underlying things ; and things are but the concrete stages through which the uniqueness of the One Self is expressed in terms of a lower plane of manifestation. Life is not merely that transcendence, which Sir Oliver Lodge sees in the directive power governing an organism. It is the transcendent, because no particular manifestation of it can even be the measure of its fullness of being. It is the unique, because when we realise its true import we find that it is the same when underlying Matter and organism, as when as a radiant centre it transcends form and matter. It is truly the One, because in it the I, the non-I and the Relation aspects find their unity, fruition and rest, while in its essence it is beyond them all.

In our lower planes also, we find that the wider and more all embracing the principle and the more abstract it is, the greater the extent of truth in it. The fundamental sources of error are the accentuation of the outer aspects of a thing, and the artificial dissociation of the appa-

rently particular thing,—the artificial wrenching it off, from the universe as a whole on the manifested side and from the Self as the One and ever unmanifest Reality. So the Gita says :—

यो मां पश्यति सर्वत्र सर्वञ्चमयि पश्यति ।

He who sees everything in the Atman and of It, and sees the Atman in everything as the one Life stringing together and underlying the concrete phenomenal things,—he is the true seer. It is made still clearer in the *sloka*.

यज्ञज्ञात्वा न पूर्णमोहमिवं याश्चसि पाण्डव ॥

“Knowing which truth, you are no longer susceptible to मोह false knowledge—and by knowing which you will see the infinity of the manifested universe of Bhutas in the Self and thence in the Supreme Self.

Says Mrs. Besant in her *Wisdom of Upanishads* (99-100) of the kind of thinking necessary. “The thinking which is effective is the thought which identifies itself with Life and not with form. * * *

* * * Master the eye and ear, teaching the eye to see the Self and not the Maya which encompasses it.”

Also—“There is only one consciousness, and that is God consciousness. * * * It might be the mightiest Deva that rules a solar system. * *

* * * It may be the consciousness that is sleeping in the sand * * * All is God consciousness, for there is none other” (*Ibid* p. 6.)

This realisation of the Self as the only Reality—not only synthesising the objective infinity around, but reducing into its transcendent homogeneity everything

apparently outside,—this is the truest Wisdom—the Theosophy of the Gods. *It is the reduction of everything separate in to the One Changeless Self*—Truly the Gita says :—

समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु तिष्ठन्तं परमेश्वरं ।

विनश्यत्स्वविनश्यन्तं यः पश्यति स पश्यति ॥

“He who sees the great Lord, the one ‘Self, living and permeating in the *self-same way* (i e without the false notions of evolution, growth &c.) everything,—the Imperishable element within the perishable, he seeth correctly.”

It is only when we see and value things from the standpoint of this one changeless Life—the Life, in which, as the Gita says, envelopes everything of multiplicity with only a fraction of its immeasurable Being—

विद्यया ह्यमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांगिनं स्थितो जगत्

that we can attain to the true Wisdom of the Self, in which there is no joy nor sorrow,—no *meum* or *teum*, no persons against persons, and where there is the fullness of the unity of Consciousness, Bliss and Existence. All else is but fragmentary ; all else is but the fruitful source of illusion and mistake.

Into this Self the universe of Name and Form can enter without disturbing the placidity and serenity of the Ocean-Self by even so much as a ripple. Then only our knowledge becomes the Divine Sophia, the Vidya who ever proclaims to us the Divine sonship—the Divine unity of man. The difference between this Divine Wisdom and Psychism is not one of phenomena and noumena ; for is not the Divine Life and Wisdom, the one Life which manifests, sustains and then reduces every

phenomenon? *The difference is rather one of attitude, of stand-point, of trend of consciousness,—in which we view the phenomenon.* The difference thus can be summed up—

(1) Whenever a phenomenon is isolated off from the rest of the infinity of manifestations of the one Life—when we seek to attach greater importance and value on any phenomenon due to its separated origin,—its special place and function in the midst of the world-phenomenon,—that is Psychism and not Theosophy.

(2) Whenever we seek to clothe any phenomenon with an authority transcending and therefore paralysing the authority of the consciousness within,—when- ever we seek to overcome with the help of the outer phenomenon the Light of the Self within —“the only light that can be shed on the Path,”—when- ever there is an element of compulsion, self-imposed or otherwise, whether recognized or not by the individual consciousness,—that is Psychism.

(3) Whenever any phenomenon is but the pro- longation or extension of a limited or separated faculty,—and appeals only to the faculty as separated from the One Consciousness,—that is Psychism.

(4) Whenever any phenomenon, tends to accentuate the already hardened separated I-aspect within the consciousness or without it,—when- ever it tends to polarise the unity of Self into the triplicity of the *knower*—the *knowledge* and the *known*,—when- ever it produces an accentuation of the centralized separated self within and therefore of the rigid world-idea in antithesis to consciousness,—that is Psychism.

(5) That which is separative, that which is special to an individual, that which is regarded as a special possession or power or its result, belonging to an individual—regarded as something different from the rest of the partless universe, of matter, energy, or consciousness, is Psychism. The spiritual possessions are those which man shares with the rest of the universe and which makes him appear as nothing in the eyes of men.

(6) That which is regarded as objective, as being in antithesis to Life and Consciousness,—that which recognises that Life can any way be moulded, modified or even improved by any thing of any plane, however high,—in one word *that which is believed to be, a power outside the consciousness, and the still small voice of the Warrior* within us, the Warrior which, as the Light on the Path says, is our truest Self—that is Psychism and not Theosophy.

(7) Whenever any phenomenon does not develop in us, however deemly it may be, the sense of the Unity of the Self,—whenever any phenomenon does not lead us on to the Self of the Universe, our real Self, — whenever any phenomenon, tends to disturb in any way the harmonising action of the Divine Sophia within us, then that phenomenon, be it one of knowledge or of power, belongs to that extent to the earthly self,—the Ahankara of man and its projected centres. That will lead to Psychism and therefore to illusion.

We must bear this in mind that it is in the attitude, —the reaction of the Self within, that a phenomenon becomes psychic or spiritual, according as we look at it

from the standpoint of the individual or the Divine Self, and according as it accentuates the one or the other aspect. For does not the Lord manifested, Himself lay down :—

भक्तानामभिजानाति यावान यथासि तत्त्वतः
ततो मां तच्छती ज्ञात्वा विशन्ते मा तदन्तर' ।

By this true devotion, which comes of the slow deliberate, though constant, elimination of the separated aspect in us, do we know, the *what* or the *qualitative* expression, *who* or the central uniqueness, and the *how much* or the *quantum* of Self as expressed in and through a given phenomenon,—thereby unifying the separative ideas of definite reality, interaction and qualities of objects in a transcendent oneness. Thus only may we neutralise the the tendency of antithesis in the outer things and realize the one Life as everything. *To see the one Self, and not merely the outer forms, however glorious,—to hear the one Self, and not the outer sounds of disharmony and discord,—to be the one Self and not merely a distinct and separate being with powers transcending even those of the Gods,—to live in the one Self, and be of It alone, is the end of Theosophy.* We must not forget that :—

ज्ञानिनां अपि चेतसि देवी भगवती हि सा ।
बलादाहृत्य मोहाय महामाया प्रयच्छति ॥ चण्डी

—that separated individuals however wise in the language of separateness are led to illusion by the Great Devi—owing to the accentuation of separateness in their so-called wisdom.

We must not forget that Theosophy, the Science of

Self, seeks not to enthrone separative Being, that its trend is not the evolution of separated semi-divine centres however high. Rather, it seeks ever to bring out the truest expression of the Self, in which the I and the World, are transmuted into a larger Consciousness, Bliss and Existence, which though the same, is yet the origin, the sustaining life and the *Alaya* of myriads of manifested universes with their numerical infinity of concrete forms. We must not lose sight of the fact that the Self is really the Unmanifest, and that what can not be measured by the hosts of universes emanating from and again indrawn into It, *can never be measured by any phenomenon in particular*. We must not forget that the truest Being of the great Lords of Compassion is this unifying One Life, and that They can never be known and realized, unless the Divine Wisdom is born in man. Life is larger than any number of phenomena or expressions of the Life; and we would be foolish, if we seek to measure its depth by the plummets of phenomenalism and psychism of any plane whatsoever. We are all of us the one Self—the rayless Dark Brahman, whom nothing phenomenal can illumine. To the extent we can realize this Transcendent Be-ness,—which is in one of its aspects also the immanent Being,—to the extent that the I in us can be one with its truest Self which is within us, do we truly live and know. Seek not to measure the Immeasurable by the modes of Psychism. For the Self is, as the Gita says—*indicated* by all the senses—and *is yet not of them* :—

सर्वेन्द्रियगुणाभावं सर्वेन्द्रिय विवर्जितं

Our estimate would be incorrect unless we realize this Transcendence in us—a transcendence which manifesting as the “I” in us, is yet at the same time the Beyond. Thus may we realize the Self and attain to *the Peace which passeth understanding and which lives equally in the heart of the devoted disciple as well as in the man of desire,—the Power which alone maketh for righteousness. May that Power uplift us! May that Peace shed its ineffable lustre on the Society! May the Light lead us on.—so that in that Peace and Light the Self may reveal itself in the plenitude of its Divine Powers which make for unity—for the consummation of the far off and yet none the less, the ever-present Divine Unity of Being towards which the whole creation moves. Thus only may the Society fulfil its purpose, and thus only may we justify its existence and function as a messenger of the Divine Life.*

ERRATA AT CORRIGENDA.

Page.—Line.

- 5—11 ... For 'self comple' read 'self-complete'
 8—8 ... For 'In man' read 'In a man'.
 8—12 ... For 'other wise' read 'otherwise'.
 9—21 ... For 'evolution' read 'evaluation'
 12—19 ... For 'this' read 'that'.
 22—26 ... After 'corresponds' add 'to'.
 26—10 ... For 'these' read 'this'.
 26—19 ... For 'leads' read 'lead'.
 26—25 ... After 'self' omit 'as'.
 27—17 ... For 'deserete' read 'discrete'.
 28—8 ... For 'this' read 'the'.
 32—12 ... For 'lead' read 'led'.
 32—28 ... After 'plane' omit the 'is' and the comma.
 38—27 ... For 'Para—' read 'Pra—'.
 39—17 ... For 'these have' read 'have these'.
 40—13 ... For 'स्वभाविक' read 'स्वाभाविक'.
 42—27 ... For 'गन्तासि' read 'गन्तासि'.
 44—20 ... For 'under' read 'under—'.
 45—23 ... For 'खलिखिद' read 'खलिद'.
 49—16 ... For 'have' read 'has'.
 51—17 ... For 'profoundity' read 'profundity'.
 53—20 ... For 'death' read 'dearth'.
 55—8 ... After 'light' add 'is'.
 56—17 ... After 'continuity' add 'of'.
 57—4 ... For 'as' read 'as—'.
 57—11 ... For 'पुनर्मीदमेव' read 'पुनर्मीदमेव'.
 59—3 ... For 'in to' read 'into'.
 62—5 & 6 ... For 'तत्त्वतः' read 'तत्त्वतः'.
 62—15 ... After 'the' omit 'the'.
 64—8 ... For 'thul' read 'that'.
 64—13 ... For 'for off' read 'far-off'.

IMPERIAL

BENGAL UNIVERSITY
29 'UG' 1917